*UNITED NATIONS*

# SECURITY COUNCIL
## OFFICIAL RECORDS

*THIRTY-NINTH YEAR*

# 2553rd MEETING: 30 AUGUST 1984

*NEW YORK*

---

CONTENTS


| | *Page* |
|---|---|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2553) | 1 |
| Adoption of the agenda | 1 |
| The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 24 August 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16713) | 1 |

## NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

# 2553rd MEETING

## Held in New York on Thursday, 30 August 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Léandre BASSOLE (Burkina Faso).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Burkina, Faso, China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zimbabwe.

**Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2553)**

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Letter dated 24 August 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16713)

*The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.*

**Adoption of the agenda**

*The agenda was adopted.*

**The situation in the Middle East:**
**Letter dated 24 August 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16713)**

1. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* In accordance with decisions taken at the 2552nd meeting, I invite the representative of Lebanon and the representative of Israel to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Kuwait and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Council table; Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Qatar, the Sudan, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Mosfir (United Arab Emirates) and Mr. Noman (Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. Mr. Shah NAWAZ (Pakistan): The situation in Lebanon has come up for the consideration of the Council, in one way or another, on three occasions earlier, and now, for the fourth time this year. In one way or another, each recourse to the Council has been linked, directly or indirectly, to one single event. That event was the Israeli aggression against Lebanon in 1982, which has remained unvacated, despite the Council's calls for cease-fire and total Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon embodied in its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). The continued Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon, in defiance of the Council resolutions and in flagrant disregard of all norms of international conduct, is an affront to the international community.

4. Yesterday [*2552nd meeting*], we heard a detailed account of the high-handed Israeli measures and inhuman practices in southern Lebanon and a fervent appeal from the representative of Lebanon, on behalf of 800,000 Lebanese suffering under the heel of the Israeli occupation forces, to end Lebanon's travail. In his account of the nature of Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon, he conveyed to us a vivid picture of the intolerable state of affairs in the occupied area, the inhabitants of which are being subjected, by the occupying Israeli authorities, to a rule of terror and torture.

5. In his statement, the representative of Lebanon spoke of the systematic terrorizing of towns and villages, sieges of homes, arrests of young and old, and of women and children, torture of detainees, taking of hostages, desecration of places of worship, closing of shops, curfews and destruction of properties. He also spoke of Israeli measures to prevent the harvesting of crops in order to inflict further hardships upon and demoralize the hapless population of southern Lebanon.

6. The woes of southern Lebanon under the Israeli heel do not end here. We are also told that the occupying Israeli forces shrink from no measure which can intimidate the population of southern Lebanon into total submission and acquiescence in Israeli expansionist aims. The siege of villages, collective detention and the periodic closing of the ports of Sidon and Tyre to prevent the unloading of wheat for the inhabitants of southern Lebanon are measures designed to achieve that very objective. The reporting building of a tunnel with the capacity to absorb all the waters of the Litani River is a clear indication of Israel's ruthless resolve to divert the natural resources of the occupied territories to its own advantage, regardless of the suffering and destruction which such a policy would entail for the occupied areas and their inhabitants.

7. Thus the Israeli presence and practices in southern Lebanon are not only in defiance of the relevant Council resolutions, but are also in flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[1] The Hague Conventions II of 1899 and IV of 1907 respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land,[2] the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

8. The tragic events which have taken place in Lebanon for the past two years and the suffering and misery with which the population of southern Lebanon continues to be afflicted are the direct consequences of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon two years ago. Israel's arrogance in maintaining its aggressive presence in Lebanon is equalled by the scorn in which it holds the Council and the impunity with which it defies its decisions and the will of the international community.

9. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon is, in itself, a product of the continued denial to the Palestinian people of their legitimate right to an independent and sovereign homeland in Palestine. The denial of this fundamental right to the people of Palestine is the root cause of the turmoil and turbulence in the Middle East, the repercussions of which have travelled far beyond that region. There will be no peace in the Middle East until justice has been done to the Palestinian people.

10. The statement [*ibid.*] made by the representative of Israel before the Council yesterday was an arrogant reassertion of Israel's self-assumed right of unrestrained aggressiveness and expansion and unbridled repression in the occupied territories, which is sought to be justified on the basis of an unacceptable thesis that these are unavoidable for Israel's security.

11. The Council was not constituted to treat the aggressor and the aggressed alike, or to judge their actions and reactions by the same yardstick. The Council's foremost responsibility is to ensure the security of small States against the depredations and predatory designs of militarily stronger neighbours. It was not constituted to condone aggression or to allow aggressor States to cover up their transgressions with tapestries of rhetoric artfully embroidered with plausible excuses and twisted facts.

12. The Council must not be deterred by these tactics from fulfilling its responsibility of providing redress to the aggrieved party. As requested by the representative of Lebanon, it is incumbent on the Council to call on Israel to cease forthwith its inhuman practices in the occupied territories of southern Lebanon and to adhere to the norms of international law and conduct in every respect.

13. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): My delegation, Sir, has already officially extended its compliments to you on your assumption of the office of the presidency for this month. As the sultry days of August come to an end, I should like to add my personal feelings of friendship to you and my official compliments on the able, fair and dedicated way in which you have conducted your high office.

14. Lebanon needs all the creative understanding and help it can get from its own citizens, from its neighbours and from the international community.

15. It is tragically true that there is far too much violence and conflict in many parts of the world, both between and within countries. But that is no reason for the Council to avoid an issue; it is even less reason for Israel to compound the confusion and to take advantage of the situation. The incidence of conflict elsewhere does not justify Israel's occupation of the territory of other States, in this particular case under discussion a third of the territory of friendly Lebanon. Even less is Israel justified in causing havoc and confusion through illegal harassment of Lebanese citizens. Israeli forces and practices are alien to the people of Lebanon, and by those policies they are not contributing to the prospects of reconciliation and peace in the region.

16. As children, we were taught that two wrongs do not make a right. Innumerable wrongs make a travesty of peace. The worst fears of Arab leaders about Israel's intentions over the past have all too often been proved right. When will the Israeli authorities change their present policies which, at ruinous cost, particularly to Israel itself, are stagnating the economic development of the region, adversely changing its demographic structure and gravely prejudicing the chances of peace?

17. Malta vehemently regrets those actions. We deeply regret the violence and the loss of life that still scars the Middle East. For us, one life lost, one victim persecuted, civilian or military, Arab or Israeli, is one too many. We also regret the opportunities to turn away from this confrontational bitterness of the past that, time and time again, are being lost.

18. My delegation made a comprehensive appraisal on the wider issue behind these incidents not so very long ago. I said at that time:

"Today, Lebanon, a founding Member of the Organization, is, to say the least, in an unprecedentedly dangerous situation, to our regret, even to our shame." [*2461st meeting, para. 157.*]

That observation remains applicable today, even though the level of conflict mercifully may have since subsided.

19. In fact, we can be almost sure that more incidents of the type detailed by the representative of Lebanon in his statement yesterday and of those reported daily in the press will arise in the future, as they have unfortunately arisen all too frequently in the past, as long as the international community does not summon up the energy, dedication and determination to tackle the root cause of the Middle East problem, which is the unacceptable plight of the Palestinian people, and the unhindered exercise of their right to self-determination.

20. It is a sad reflection on our times that both on the question of Palestine and on the situation in Lebanon, we have witnessed regression, not progress.

21. We will not today repeat the arguments we advanced on that previous occasion, except to stress their continued validity. However, we have at least to emphasize the growing urgency for concerted political action in the search for an enduring and equitable solution, on the basis of the general principles already identified. Action must be taken at the roots to cure the disease: we must not be content merely with sporadic reactions to its symptoms.

22. In response to this clear need, next week at Valletta, the non-aligned countries of the Mediterranean will meet in a dedicated effort at ministerial level to chart a new course designed to reduce tension and to seek to expand areas for fruitful co-operation through concerted action. We hope eventually that others may see the wisdom of this choice and join us in our common efforts. The situation in the Middle East obviously casts a long shadow over adjoining regions, none more so than in the Mediterranean.

23. In the meantime, we urge Israel to turn away from its militaristic policies, to respect internationally recognized principles and the decisions of the Council, and to join others in a peace process which will restore full sovereignty to the people of Lebanon within its own internationally recognized boundaries and will also do justice to the rights of the Palestinian people. To the people of Lebanon, we pledge full solidarity in their quest for peace and national reconciliation, and we ask all Member States not to abandon Lebanon in its hour of need.

24. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) [*interpretation from Russian*]: The Soviet delegation supports Lebanon's addressing the Council with respect to the inadmissible actions by the Israeli occupying authorities in the southern part of that country which they have seized. For 26 months the Israeli military clique has continued to occupy one third of Lebanese territory. This was a direct result of the fact that Israel has obstinately refused to implement resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), the latter calling for an immediate unconditional withdrawal of the aggressor's forces from Lebanon. This prime reason was quite rightly mentioned yesterday in the statement made by the representative of Lebanon.

25. Time has but paid to the lying, propagandistic verbiage of the Israeli statement and has laid bare the true face of the Israeli aggressors. For more than two years now they have been impudently domineering in Lebanon. They sow undisguised terror and violence there and openly seek to perpetuate their occupation of part of yet another Arab country.

26. For the population of southern Lebanon the Israeli occupation means daily mass repression, shooting of unarmed inhabitants, systematic raids and arrests, overcrowded prisons and concentration camps. In one of them alone, the notorious Ansar camp, the place of Palestinian prisoners has now been taken by more than 700 Lebanese prisoners.

27. As regards Israeli policies in southern Lebanon with respect to human rights, the occupying forces are attempting to subvert the economic life of the areas under their domination. Here, too, we witness the arbitrary violation of economic links between southern Lebanon and the rest of the country, as well as a virtual total blockade on the transport of local products through Israeli check-points and the sytematic destruction of agricultural plantations and crops. In other words, the broad experience of colonial development in the West Bank, the Gaza sector and the Syrian Golan Heights is now cynically being used by Israel in Lebanon.

28. The policies and practices of Israel in southern Lebanon incontrovertibly demonstrate Tel Aviv's desire to turn that region into another field for creeping annexation, to isolate it and wrench it away from the rest of the country, to push further northwards the borders of Zionist expansion.

29. It is quite clear that this entire inadmissible practice by Israeli occupying forces in southern Lebanon must be terminated.

30. It is the duty of the Council to demand that Israel cease forthwith its policy of terror in the occupied territory of Lebanon. Israel must rescind all the discriminatory, political, economic and other measures it has introduced there with respect to the local people. Israel's attempts to dismember Lebanon, to undermine the economic life of the occupied regions, to exploit in a predatory manner the natural resources, must be rebuffed. But these are merely palliatives. The main point is that Israel must, without further ado, put an end to its illegal occupation of Lebanon and withdraw its

troops. This has been called for by Council resolutions. The implementation of those resolutions is the key to the elimination of the protracted, abnormal situation in Lebanon.

31. And here we come to the cardinal issue: who gave the go-ahead for Israel's aggression in 1982 against Lebanon? Why has Israel's occupation of one third of that Arab country continued for more than two years? The answer to these questions is clear: it is that, without the support of the United States, Israel's recent act of aggression itself and the entrenchment of Israeli forces in Lebanon would have been impossible. This is proved by some incontrovertible facts.

32. Fact number 1: The United States knew that Israel was preparing an act of aggression against Lebanon eight months before it started. However, the United States did nothing to prevent Israel's invasion. Quite clearly, Washington sanctioned that aggression.

33. Fact number 2: In August 1982, at the height of Israel's aggression in Lebanon, the United States was the only member of the Council that voted against the cessation of military assistance to Israel. Having vetoed that draft resolution of the Council at that time [*S/15347/Rev.1*], the United States took the part of the aggressor and defended it.

34. Fact number 3: Soon afterwards, American troops and military units of certain other North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries appeared in Lebanon in the guise of a Multinational Force, which ostensibly was seeking to assist Lebanon and even the Palestinians. In reality, as everyone soon learned, this was an attempt to turn Lebanese territory into an anti-Arab military base for the United States and NATO in the Middle East.

35. Fact number 4: In May 1983, by exerting gross pressure, the United States assisted Israel in imposing on Lebanon a lopsided, humiliating and insidious agreement. In other words, the United States actively assisted the aggressor to solidify the gains of its aggression in Lebanon.

36. Fact number 5: It was precisely the United States, throwing off the pretence of peace-maker, that in 1983 unleashed military actions in Lebanon. The massive shelling from the warship *USS New Jersey* and other United States naval vessels and the barbaric bombings by American aeroplanes of Lebanese settlements clearly revealed that the United States had unleashed open warfare against the Arabs.

37. Fact number 6: For more than two years the United States has been doing its utmost to prevent the implementation of Council resolutions concerning an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. Thus the United States is trying to make sure that Lebanon meets with the same fate as the Arab lands occupied in 1967, that is, gradual absorption by Israel. Of course, if the United States representatives want us to continue this list of United States actions in Lebanon and surrounding area, we can.

38. However, those who like to dictate Lebanon's fate from beyond the seas made a serious mistake: the troops of the American interventionists were shamefacedly compelled to evacuate Lebanon; the lopsided agreement imposed on Lebanon by Israel and the United States failed. That is why attempts to impose on Lebanon systems from outside constitute not only a dangerous policy but a myopic and fruitless one. Tel Aviv and Washington should understand that their policy grossly to trample underfoot the sovereign rights of States and the imposition of alien decisions on other countries and peoples through the use of force is obviously doomed to failure, in the Middle East as, indeed, in other parts of the world.

39. The way to achieve genuine peace in the Middle East is by a comprehensive political settlement involving collective efforts under the aegis of the United Nations, and the best machinery for this would be an international conference on the Middle East.

40. A detailed programme here has been set forth in the Soviet proposals dated 29 July this year [*see S/16685, annex*]. We are convinced of the validity, fairness and political fair-sightedness of our proposals. They provide an alternative to the continuation in the Middle East of the policies of Israeli aggression in the guise of protecting the interests of Israel. They are an alternative to the policy of building up an imperialist military presence in the Middle East in the guise of assisting the Arabs.

41. A just, and therefore a lasting, peace in the Middle East is not only possible, it is urgent.

42. Mr. VERMA (India): My delegation has already had an opportunity to felicitate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of August. India enjoys friendly and cordial relations with your country, Burkina Faso. We share the conviction that the Council is the richer for your varied diplomatic experience and wise counsel and that under your stewardship it will be able effectively to address itself to the pressing problems before us.

43. May I also renew to your predecessor, the representative of the United States, our appreciation of her able and dignified stewardship of the Council last month.

44. The Council is once again meeting to consider the tragic situation prevailing in Lebanon. The representative of Lebanon has given us a moving account of the untold suffering of the hapless civilian population in southern Lebanon as a result of Israel's harsh and repressive policies. Torture, harassment, detentions, raids and other inhuman practices appear to have become the order of the day.

45. The serious economic dislocation resulting from Israel's closure of roads, destruction of crops, forced premature harvesting of fields and the like add to the untold human misery. The human rights of the Lebanese people in the occupied areas are being trampled upon mercilessly. The actions of the Israeli occupying authorities are in clear violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Conventions[1] and the norms of international law. It is indeed appropriate that the Council, which is entrusted under the Charter with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should take upon itself the task of finding ways and means of ameliorating this serious situation which could have wider repercussions for peace and stability in the region.

46. In June 1982, the international community was a witness to Israel's blatant aggression against Lebanon. The memory of atrocities committed by Israel against the innocent Lebanese and Palestinian people and of the genocidal massacres of Sabra and Shatila still haunt our minds. The invasion was undertaken on the alleged grounds of self-preservation and security. It was obviously a part of Israel's calculated policy to achieve a systematic decimation of the Palestinian people and a complete erosion of the independence and sovereignty of Lebanon. The illegal occupation by Israel of Lebanese territory continues till today, and Israel's stranglehold is strengthened with each passing day.

47. With the passage of time and with mounting pressures from several quaters for a just and comprehensive peace in the area, we would have expected Israel to display a greater sense of wisdom, sobriety and responsibility. On the contrary, the Israeli occupation forces have continued to inflict hardships and inhuman treatment on the residents of the area, in clear violation of the cherished principles of international law. In addition, we have been informed of Israel's actions to carry out illegal construction with a view to diverting the waters of the Wazzani and Litani rivers to its own territory and completely to isolate and cut off southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district from the rest of the country. Such acts will only result in further hardships for the civilian population and should be stopped forthwith.

48. In the past the Council has adopted various resolutions seeking to bring about an immediate end to the fighting in that war-torn country and demanding that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. Unfortunately, those resolutions have remained unimplemented. We call for the speedy implementation of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) in order to ensure the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territories.

49. The continuing conflict in the Middle East remains a most serious threat to peace. The tragedy in Lebanon is a symptom of the malaise that has caused untold suffering to thousands of innocent persons in that country. Any solution of the problem of Lebanon cannot be divorced from our search for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East which must be based on the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national and human rights.

50. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has been deeply concerned over the grave situation prevailing in Lebanon. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, reaffirmed its support for the safety of Lebanon, its territorial integrity, independence and right to exercise its sovereignty throughout its territory within its internationally recognized boudaries. The Conference also called upon all States to support Lebanon in the implementation of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) in order to ensure the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, p. 28*]. The cherished principles of our Movement are being defied by Israel's continuing occupation of Lebanon. We would like to see peace and stability restored in Lebanon.

51. The Government and the people of India have been profoundly anguished over the tragic events in Lebanon. Our concern and sorrow at those tragic occurrences have been expressed on a number of occasions in our Parliament and elsewhere, including in the Security Council and the General Assembly. From the facts which have been placed before the Council it is beyond doubt that responsibility for the hardships and the inhuman treatment of the civilian population of southern Lebanon lies squarely with the Israeli authorities.

52. My Government fully supports Lebanon's just demands, as outlined in the statement by the representative of Lebanon, for the immediate implementation of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and Israel's complete withdrawal to Lebanon's internationally recognized boundaries; for the immediate cessation of Israeli practices in the occupied territories; and for the need for Israel to respect the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the norms of international law and the 1949 Geneva Conventions, among others.

53. The time has come for the Council to act decisively and with a sense of purpose to halt Israeli aggression and intransigence. We hope that the Council will discharge its responsibility in order to restore the rule of law and civilized conduct in Lebanon.

54. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) [*interpretation from Chinese*]: The Chinese delegation has listened attentively to the statement by the representative of Lebanon.

55. The Chinese Government and people condemn Israel's forcible occupation of southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district and the atroc-

ities perpetrated against the Lebanese people in those areas, and support the heroic struggle of the Lebanese people and the just position and legitimate demands of the Lebanese Government.

56. It is well known that the Israeli authorities have all along harboured ambitious designs on Lebanon and obstinately pursued a policy of aggression and expansion. Since their flagrant massive military invasion of Lebanon in June 1982, the Israeli authorities have to date been pertinaciously occupying the southern part of the country and reinforcing their occupation there. The Israeli occupation forces frequently storm and lay siege to the peaceful towns and villages in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, and unscrupulously search or detain the innocent local Lebanese, including the aged, women and children. They may blockade ports and close highways at will and relentlessly plunder or destroy the natural resources and damage the commercial, cultural and educational installations there. These perverse acts on the part of the Israeli aggressor troops have reduced Lebanon to a devastated land where the people live in dire misery. As the Lebanese Government has pointed out time and again, the Israeli practices in Lebanon have seriously violated international law and trampled underfoot international conventions and the Charter of the United Nations. They should be righteously condemned by all the justice-upholding countries and peoples of the world.

57. Where there is aggression and occupation, there is resistance; and the longer the occupation, the stronger the resistance. This is a law of history. It is precisely the cruel oppression by the Israeli occupying authorities that has forced the Lebanese people to rise up in resistance and self-defence. The struggle of the Lebanese people is a just one, and it will continue to receive widespread support from the international community.

58. The Israeli military occupation of southern Lebanon constitutes the biggest obstacle to the restoration of the state sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and the realization of unification of the country and the unity of the nation. Since its establishment, the Lebanese Government of National Unity has made the recovery of southern Lebanon from Israeli occupation an important component of its administrative programme. We are convinced that, so long as the Lebanese Government and people close ranks, they will certainly accomplish the noble cause of safeguarding their national independence and unification.

59. The Chinese delegation wishes to reiterate that the Council should play an active role in the question of Lebanon and should implement in real earnest the relevant resolutions it has adopted; in the meantime, it should consider other practical measures in the light of the present circumstances so as to preserve Lebanon's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and eliminate foreign aggression and interference. The key to the solution of the Lebanese question is the withdrawal of Israeli troops. The Chinese delegation is ready to work with the other members of the Council and make its due contribution to supporting the just cause of the Lebanese people.

60. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French)*: The next speaker is the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Massamba Sarré. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

61. Mr. SARRÉ (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) *[interpretation from French]*: First I should like to thank the members of the Council for having been good enough once again to allow me to participate in this debate, the importance of which is obvious to everyone.

62. I should also like most sincerely and warmly to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We know you as a diplomat well versed in international affairs and committed to the ideals of peace and justice; hence I am convinced that the Council's work will be successful.

63. I wish also to pay tribute to your predecessor, Mrs. Jeane Kirkpatrick, representative of the United States, for the exemplary manner in which she performed her lofty duties.

64. We have met again to take up the situation in Lebanon. In May of this year, during another meeting on the same subject and on the situation in the Ein El-Helweh Palestinian camps *[2540th meeting]*, we had thought that the Council would finally find the ways and means to enable that country, an innocent victim, to recover its independence and dignity, the better to devote itself to the task of reconstruction and, what is more, to make a contribution to the efforts to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. That perfectly legitimate hope quickly gave way to recurring outbreaks of violence to the point of threatening Lebanon's very existence as a country, which merely aspires to living in peace with all the other States of the region.

65. However, this acknowledgement of failure should not lead to resignation on the part of the international community; quite the contrary. It is the duty and the responsibility of the Council to take all appropriate steps to save Lebanon from imminent disintegration. Indeed, everything leads us to believe that Israeli practices in southern Lebanon point in that direction. Not content with occupying that part of Lebanon thereby flouting the norms of international law and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, Israel is doing everything possible to remove it from Lebanese sovereignty. For example, to go from one place to another in their own territory the Lebanese today must first obtain permission from the Israeli authorities. For the rest, I would refer members of the Council to the very enlightening statement made yesterday by the representative of Lebanon.

66. In light of all that took place yesterday, and also taking account of the deliberations that have been going on for nearly two years on the situation prevailing in Lebanon, I believe that today we must rise above mutual recriminations and get down to the task of peace, which is our responsibility. The framework for peace has been defined by the General Assembly in its resolution 38/58 C of 13 December 1983. The Secretary-General, to whom we pay tribute for his constant efforts to resolve the Middle East crisis, has already taken the necessary steps with the parties concerned with a view to implementing that resolution. The replies received to date by the Secretary-General are very encouraging, and we can say that the international community as a whole supports a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question.

67. Indeed, in a statement on 27 March 1984 on the Middle East [*see S/16456, annex*], the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States members of the European Economic Community declared that any solution of this question must include the right to existence and to security of all States, including Israel, and that any settlement—and I stress this—must take into account the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, which implies recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. Those States called on all parties to act in keeping with these principles and to begin the necessary negotiations to apply them.

68. Similarly, the seventy-first Inter-Parliamentary Conference, held at Geneva from 2 to 7 April 1984, adopted a resolution entitled "Escalation of the dangers threatening international peace and security in the Middle East region", in which the Conference stressed the need to promote dialogue between the parties concerned with a view to finding a lasting solution to the crisis.

69. More recently, at the North American Non-Governmental Organization Symposium on the Question of Palestine, held from 25 to 27 June at United Nations Headquarters, the representatives of 60 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) called upon the peoples and Governments of the United States and Canada to take decisive action to bring about a comprehensive just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the core of which is the question of Palestine. They believed that all the parties to the conflict should meet at an International Peace Conference on the Middle East, as called for by the General Assembly in its resolution 38/58 C.

70. At the ninth United Nations Seminar on the Question of Palestine, held at Tunis from 14 to 17 August, the participants, which included parliamentarians from Europe and Africa, unanimously endorsed the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East.

71. Following that seminar, the first International Meeting of Non-Governmental Organizations on the Question of Palestine was held at Geneva from 20 to 22 August. Ninety-eight NGOs participated, including six from Israel. In fact, four Israeli—Jews and Palestinians—were among the keynote speakers. In the resolution adopted at that meeting, the NGOs pledged direct support for General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, which calls for an International Peace Conference on the Middle East.

72. As members will have seen, there is an international consensus on the need for a comprehensive just and lasting settlement of the question of the Middle East and Palestine. The international community also espouses the idea that there can be no peace in the Middle East so long as the question of Palestine has not been settled in a just and lasting manner.

73. In the light of all these considerations, the Council, whose role it is to promote international peace and security, must get down to action. In so doing it will discharge its mandate and live up to the expectations of history. Until that happens, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People expresses solidarity with the people of Lebanon, which has suffered so much to attain justice. It is high time that justice, full sovereignty and integrity were returned to the people of Lebanon.

74. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French)*: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure at its 2552nd meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

75. Mr. MAKSOUD: Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to express to you on behalf of the League of Arab States our deep appreciation for the gracious invitation you have extended to me. Through you I should like also to thank the members who have agreed to extend this invitation.

76. Needless to say, Sir, your leadership in the deliberations of the Council has proven to be an articulation of the wisdom that is characteristic of the people of your country and the continent of Africa.

77. Yesterday the representative of Lebanon made a thorough statement on the Israeli practices that tend to dehumanize the situation in southern Lebanon and in the Bekaa Valley, areas under Israeli occupation since June 1982, areas under occupation by Israel despite the fact that there have been two unanimous resolutions of the Council asking Israel forthwith to withdraw its occupation force from southern Lebanon.

78. Two years have elapsed, and we are here today, trying, despite the filibustering techniques of the Israeli representatives in the Council, to focus on the inhuman, coercive practices of Israeli occupation forces in southern Lebanon and in the Bekaa Valley.

79. What comes to mind at this particular juncture is that here is an Arab country, a founding member of the League of Arab States, a Founding Member of the United Nations, one of the principal participants and authors of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, coming before the Council to plead with it to have the human rights of the people of southern Lebanon and the Bekaa Valley respected under the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,' and that the violations of human rights are an overspill of the violation by Israel of Lebanese sovereignty. And to the extent that Israel violates the sovereignty of Lebanon it inextricably violates the human rights of the people under its occupation.

80. As it has presented the case of Lebanon before the Council, the Lebanese delegation has sought to define the parameters of the Council's deliberations because of the urgent action it and the Government of Lebanon feel is necessary to mitigate the dehumanizing process that is taking place and the practices being engaged in by the Israeli occupation in all fields of endeavour.

81. Listening to the delegation of Lebanon yesterday state in detail the various practices and violations, I am sure many members sought, as we did, to find a pattern of behaviour on the part of the occupation authority in Lebanon. I am sure we can all discern such a pattern. Upon investigation I have concluded, as I am sure many of us have, that there is indeed a definite pattern of bahaviour on the part of the occupation forces of Israel. The pattern is that there is no pattern, that Israel seeks one day to break into houses, to burn houses to create the impression that it is fighting so-called terrorists, that it envisages and anticipates the possibility of there being so-called terrorists.

82. The resistance of the people of the south of Lebanon is construed as either actual terrorism or as potential terrorism; therefore the pattern is that there is no pattern—a surprise atttack on one town, a summoning of the villagers in one particular village or another, the burning of agricultural products, restricting citizens' right of free transport: closing a road and opening it up another day. In order to create an impression among the Lebanese that there is no pattern for Israel's coercive measures and techniques of intimidation, it is essential to thwart all resistance—whether actual resistance on the ground or diplomatic resistance in the Security Council—as well as mobilization on the international moral level; everybody—diplomatically—must be thrown off balance. There must not develop a coherent assessment of what Israel is doing, for a coherent assessment would lead to a coherent response.

83. It is this deliberateness in precluding a pattern of behaviour that is characteristic of Israeli occupation and practices in the southern part of Lebanon. These measures in southern Lebanon since the June 1982 occupation and prior thereto—since the invasion of Lebanon in 1978—have been designed to treat southern Lebanon as a suspended Territory, through occupation directly or occupation by proxy, through mercenaries or by direct control. The southern part of Lebanon, in the Israeli's perception and treatment, the sovereignty of the central Government of Lebanon over the southern part of Lebanon is a concept of suspended sovereignty. The central authority of the Government of Lebanon, the legitimate Government of Lebanon, can exercise certain formulas of an administrative presence, but it cannot have absolute sovereignty. The issue of sovereignty must be suspended because Israel is not yet ready or has not developed its expansionist position and policy to the extent of claiming sovereignty over the southern part of Lebanon; hence the pretence of the Israeli representatives that the Israeli authorities have no territorial ambitions in Lebanon or any reason to divert and reroute water supplies from the Litani and Hasbani rivers.

84. So we have a new jurisprudential position, the notion that the southern part of Lebanon should be excluded from the issue of genuine sovereignty. Perhaps for the sake of compromising with the international community Israel temporarily concedes that there is a legalistic form of sovereignty over the southern part of Lebanon; yet it insists that there should not be a factual exercise of sovereignty over that part of Lebanon.

85. Therein lies the whole paradox of behaviour that Israel has exhibited throughout its relationship to the crisis in the southern part of Lebanon. Prior to 1978 and subsequently, Israel claimed that the Palestinian presence in southern Lebanon gave it a free hand to discipline this Palestinian presence and violate the sovereignty of Lebanon. Then when the Security Council ordered Israel to withdraw, it complied in form in order to deny in substance the right of the Lebanese central authority to exercise sovereignty in the southern part of Lebanon. It created and provided the mechanism, the deployment, the finance and the support for a so-called proxy army in southern Lebanon in order to deny consistently, systematically and with a prior plan the right and the ability of the central authority of Lebanon to exercise its prerogatives fully—not only administratively but in terms of security, order and military presence. Israel has deliberately prevented the Lebanese Army from reaching southern Lebanon to exercise its proper functions of defending Lebanon. It has undermined all the security arrangements which were made by the Armistice Commission in southern Lebanon; it has done so in order to create a situation whereby the south of Lebanon is deprived of its status as a part of sovereign Lebanon; its suspended sovereignty emerges from the suspended ability of the central Government of Lebanon to exercise its administrative and security functions in southern Lebanon.

86. As we focus again on the practices which were spelt out by the representative of Lebanon, we discover, despite the attempted cover-up and obfuscation, the minute details of Israeli efforts to befuddle public

opinion and the international community. In seeking to redress a single violation one is faced with a proliferation of violations. In their incremental impact they constitute one of the most devastating violations of the sovereign rights of Lebanon, the human rights of the Lebanese and of human rights in general, as enshrined in international law and international conventions. Israel's meticulous pursuit of these practices testifies to the Israeli objective of fragmenting its oppressive measures in order to prevent the United Nations, the international community, from perceiving and coming to grips with the whole pattern and plan of Israel in southern Lebanon.

87. So, as we request redress for the grievances flowing from these oppressive violations—violations engineered by Israel in order to bog us down in redressing details—we find that this is not accidental, and that the occupation is no "provisional occupation". We find that all this emerges from a basic philosophy governing the State of Israel and its attitude towards the Arab States in general and towards Lebanon in particular.

88. For the last decade, Lebanon has experienced a series of haemorrhages and tragedies. Of course, because Lebanon is a member of the League of Arab States this is a matter of deep concern for the Arab League. The visit today by the Secretary-General of the Arab League to the President of Lebanon, Mr. Amin Gemayel, and to the Prime Minister of Lebanon, Mr. Karame, indicates that the League of Arab States is definitely committed to expediting the process of Lebanon's reconstruction and rehabilitation and the national unity which its present Government represents and is committed to.

89. At certain moments, I might speak with a measure of emotion, because this is my country. I witness the attempts by Israeli representatives to make analogies about their occupation, and to manipulate the agony of the Lebanese at this particular moment, putting it forward that such agony is inherent and constant in the Lebanese body politic. I think that this degree of cynicism and lack of accountability is impermissible in the international community.

90. Of course, we are experiencing a great deal of agony in Lebanon: the baptism by blood inflicted basically by Israeli occupation; Israel's refusal since 1948 to implement the very resolutions which gave it its birth certificate by permitting the exercise by the Palestinians of their right to return to their homes and to their homeland; Israel's attempt to strip all United Nations resolutions pertaining to the Palestinian question of their relevance and efficacy, so that it can build an exclusively Jewish State, precluding the right of the people of Palestine to return and thus creating the socio-economic consequence of a demographic presence by repeatedly striking at the Lebanese and Palestinian camps under one pretext or another. Such pretexts have become the substitute for Israel's implementation of United Nations resolutions; they have become Israel's diversionary technique intended to bog us down.

91. Of course, the socio-economic problems remain, but they represent Lebanon's quest—often, perhaps, a tragic quest—to rediscover its cohesion, to rediscover its unity, to rediscover its purpose, to rediscover its resilience. Lebanon the reality and Lebanon the dream are what is represented today by the Government of National Unity, in which all the contending political forces are seeking to bring credibility and effectiveness to the authority of the Government, a credibility and effectiveness which could be much facilitated by the credible and effective establishment of that authority in the southern part of Lebanon.

92. It is from there that the roots of destabilization are set down and manipulated by Israel—which seems to delight in analogies about the agony of the Lebanese—in order to perpetuate its military, political and strategic hegemony over the southern part of Lebanon. For Israel is seeking to settle many accounts on the small territory of the southern part of Lebanon: accounts with the United Nations through the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and accounts with United Nations resolutions; accounts with the Arab States; accounts with the pluralistic society of Lebanon.

93. That is why the practices that have been spelt out clearly and unquestionably are practices intended to uncouple the actual from the objective: the actual practices of Israel from the objectives of Israel. That is why we are incessantly consumed by the bloodthirstiness of Israeli occupation in the southern part of Lebanon; consumed by the need to relieve the people of the south of Lebanon and permit them to engage in free traffic, to have their products marketed, to have their students' examinations uninterrupted, to have a free flow of population, to reunify families, to alleviate the housing problems in Beirut and other places.

94. We find that Israel wants us to be consumed with its practices, so that we will feel helpless in facing it and hopeless in preventing its objective from being fulfilled. That is why the tragedy of Lebanon is so cruelly and crudely manipulated.

95. As to the analogies and comparisons about the territory north of the Awali River, let us assume for a moment that at times there have been intermittent conflicts and tragic disputes. As I have said, this is a part of our quest in Lebanon—the Lebanese quest and the Arab quest—to bring about the overall security of Lebanon and its unity.

96. But what is Israel doing south of the Awali River? Why will Israel, as it says, "continue until it has ensured the security of its borders"? For 11 months prior to the invasion of Lebanon, to which the United States delegation can testify, there was absolutely no incident on the borders of southern Lebanon. Now

there is resistance on the part of the population in southern Lebanon. What does Israel expect from the people of the south of Lebanon who are being systematically harassed? Does it expect them to be submissive? Are Israel's plans being interrupted by that resistance? Or is submissiveness supposed to be inherent in any people that Israel dominates or whose land it seeks to occupy? Is it inherent in Israeli policy that the people of southern Lebanon—or of the West Bank and of the Golan Heights for that matter—should be perpetually humiliated by the exercise of Israeli territorial hegemony over us under the pretext of Israel's security?

97. Of course the representatives of Israel seek to blow out of proportion a statement which to all the Arabs is axiomatic. I am referring to the statement made yesterday [*2552nd meeting*] by the Syrian ambassador when he said "the Lebanese people of which we are a part". The Israeli representative, in his conjured paranoia, sought again to reinforce his diversionary techniques. Let me state it clearly: of course the Lebanese are part of the Syrians and the Syrians are part of the Lebanese, and so are all the Arab peoples part of each other. There are in the Arab world two basic legitimacies: the legitimacy of the sovereignty of independent Arab States and the legitimacy of our national constituency of belonging to one Arab culture, one Arab civilization and one Arab destiny. It is this reconciliation of the two legitimacies which neither Israel nor, unfortunately, the United States can comprehend, as is evident in its breach of intellectual contract when it sought to broker the Israeli-Lebanese Agreement of 17 May 1983. That Agreement does not take into consideration the interplay and the dynamic interaction of these two legitimacies in the Arab world: the Arab national constituency and the sovereignty and independence of independent Arab States. When it did not take that into consideration, it planted the seeds of its undoing. That is why, when the Karame Government was formed in the aftermath of the abrogation of the so-called Israeli-Lebanese Agreement, the infrastructure for the national unity of Lebanon became possible and the present Government of Lebanon represents that. Lebanon, the Arab States in general and the Arab League did not expect that "breach of intellectual contract" by the United States in its failure to comprehend the dynamic interaction between these two legitimacies, especially since the United States was foremost in helping to bring about this Arab national awareness through the various universities and the school systems that it established, through the presence of a large community of Arab-Americans in this country, through its intellectual anti-colonial history and through its understanding in the various universities and colleges which are engaged in the study of Arab Middle Eastern culture. We thought that the United States would not only understand the reality of this interaction but that it could have a positive input for stability in the region and for world stability and peace as a whole.

98. As I have often stated, instead of brooding over the abrogation of the so-called Israeli-Lebanese Agreement, the United States should consider this as a time of reassessment of its overall policies in Lebanon and in the Middle East in general. I do not want to repeat what has often been stated, namely, that in an election year in the United States politics overtake policies. There are rumours and innuendoes in the United States—which I do not want to accept because of my deep affection for the United States—that it cannot be embarrassed by any attempt to condemn Israel or to censure it or to deplore its activities or even mildly to criticize it because of pragmatic considerations which will not be announced, which will not be vocalized and which will not be stated. But the Arab countries, especially those that are friends of the United States, should understand the subtleties and not force the issue, especially when it pertains to anything that concerns Israel at this juncture.

99. We in the Arab world do not seek any headlong diplomatic confrontations with the United States. But we are eager—and I think we have a right to be eager—that the United States should be sensitized to the actual, well-proved and documented grievances that the Lebanese under Israeli occupation face and experience, that the Palestinians under occupation face and experience, that the Syrians in the Golan Heights face and experience. We want the United States to be sensitized because we refuse to consider that a super-Power with global responsibilities for peace and international security would allow its judgement to be deflected by considerations that it will not announce but that it will subtly communicate.

100. And then we are told that the occupation by Israel of southern Lebanon is provisional. Well, what is the definition of provisional? In the Israeli lexicon provisional means that there is no commitment to a particular date. Israeli occupation of the West Bank moved from the fact of occupied territories to administered territories, and later to another level of annexed territories—or, rather, Judea and Samaria—into a situation also of suspended sovereignty, to their claim to its annexation as being equal to the rights of the Palestinians to have their own State in their own homeland. Provisional until when? We will probably hear the answer: until Israel determines that its security is established.

101. It arrogates that right to itself—not to the United Nations mechanisms, not to international judgement, not to the international community—and even then it does not allow any input into the determination of whether there is security or not. It arrogates to itself an absolute right to determine "when and if". So the term "provisional", in the lexicon of Israel, has the seeds of permanency, because semantic acrobatics have never eluded Zionist parlance.

102. Once again the Council is faced with an urgent request to investigate the charges, although the charges are documented and do not require investigation. Would the "provisional" occupiers of southern Lebanon allow an investigation by the Council? Or are

there hints that the Council, whose power is determined and defined by the Charter of the United Nations, must face a situation of powerlessness on any issue in which Israel is involved?

103. Israel considers that the United Nations should treat it exceptionally because it thinks that it has an exceptional relationship with the United States. Perhaps the relationship is exceptional, but we still believe, and we want to believe, that there is a residual sense of fairness and objectivity in the United States pertaining to the fate of Lebanon and to the agony and tragedy of the southern part of Lebanon, that this exceptional relationship with Israel will not obfuscate its sense of objectivity and its tradition of fairness.

104. That is why, inasmuch as Lebanon has defined the parameters of the human tragedy of the people of southern Lebanon and the Bekaa Valley, something beyond a consensus sufficient to deter Israel from the perpetuation of its so-called provisional occupation may emerge and then the notion of "suspended sovereignty" will forever be suspended and Lebanon will recover its total authority over all its territory.

105. The PRESIDENT *(interpetation from French)*: The next speaker is the representative of Yemen. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

106. Mr. NOMAN (Yemen) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. This will undoubtedly contribute to guiding the work of this body on the right path, thanks to your well-known wisdom and expertise. At the same time, I should like to extend my thanks to your predecessor, the representative of the United States, for her presidency and the able manner in which she conducted the work of the Council last month.

107. Yesterday, we have all listened with the utmost attention to the statement of the representative of fraternal Lebanon on the situation in southern Lebanon, which is occupied by Israel. This is a matter of deep concern for my Government, as well as a great number of other peace-loving States, because it firmly believes that the continued Israeli acts against Lebanon and other neighbouring Arab States are a constant threat to peace and security in the Middle East and the world.

108. In June 1982, the Council adopted two resolutions on the question, 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), the latter demanding that Israel immediately and unconditionally withdraw from Lebanese territories. As everyone knows, Israel has not complied with these two resolutions and has persisted in rejecting all other relevant resolutions of the Council, as well as all international instruments.

109. The practices of the Israeli occupation authorities in southern Lebanon, western Bekaa and the Rashaya district are but a link in an endless chain, starting with the occupation of the land of Palestine and the establishment thereon of the State of Israel and Israel's repeated and unjust wars against the Arab people and its attempts to annihilate the Palestinian people.

110. We are now witnessing its practices against southern Lebanon aimed at cutting it off from the motherland and illegally controlling its natural resources. These practices follow upon those that have been directed against the Palestinian people in its camps in Lebanon.

111. Undoubtedly, the Council still remembers the Israeli massacres against Palestinians and Lebanese in Sabra and Shatila, and its meeting last May [*2540th meeting*] on the massacres in the Palestinian Ein El-Helweh camp.

112. My Government is convinced that Israel's attempts to portray itself as seeking peace in the Middle East are but false and deceitful, as demonstrated by its continued rejection of all peace initiatives, including the American initiative.[4]

113. Our conviction is strengthened by Israel's continuous hampering of the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East that would be attended by all parties. The convening of that Conference was requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 38/58 C, of 13 December 1983.

114. While the question of Palestine has remained unresolved for more than three decades and represents a set-back for human ideals and morality, Israel's continued occupation of parts of Lebanon and other neighbouring Arab States is concrete evidence of the increasing gap between objectives and ambitions, on the one hand, and the painful reality of international relations, on the other hand. Israel has a great ally which supports its expansionist plans and shields it from all international pressure or sanctions in response to its repeated crimes, the most recent of which—its crimes in Lebanon—are now before the Council.

115. The Government of the Yemen Arab Republic firmly supports Lebanon's just demands for Israel's immediate and unconditional withdrawal in implementation of the relevant Council resolutions. We call for measures to compel Israel to lift its siege of regions under its occupation, to respect the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the norms of international law and relevant international conventions and to abide by Lebanon's established sovereignty over its natural resources and occupied territory.

116. Moreover, we call upon the Council to affirm the necessity of protecting the safety and security of the Palestinians in their camps in southern Lebanon. We reaffirm our position of principle that the Palestinian people must be granted its right to self-determination and to statehood on its own soil, and that the Palestine

Liberation Organization (PLO) must be accorded recognition as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. That is the only realistic approach to the solution of the question of the Middle East.

117. Our request is but a call to the Council to fulfil its obligations under the Charter to maintain international peace and security.

118. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French)*: I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak.

119. Mr. BLUM (Israel): With regard to the statement that we heard today from Mr. Maksoud, I think it can be disposed of summarily. His theorizing about an alleged Israeli concept of suspended sovereignty in southern Lebanon is utter and unadulterated nonsense. The fact that this sham theory was proclaimed by Mr. Maksoud in so loud a voice merely attests to the fact that he is an adherent of the maxim, "Raise your voice; argument is weak".

120. Sovereignty in southern Lebanon, as in other parts of that country, belongs exclusively to Lebanon and to Lebanon alone. Mr. Maksoud, who has been oblivious to this simple fact over the past decade, would do well to remind the Syrian occupiers and the terrorist PLO of this fact.

121. Mr. Maksoud also explained to us that the Israeli-Lebanese Agreement of 17 May 1983 failed to recognize, and I hope I quote him verbatim, "the dynamic interaction of [these] two legitimacies" [*para. 97, above*] and thus sought to justify the unilateral renunciation by Lebanon of that Agreement. No amount of intellectual acrobatics of whatever decibels by Mr. Maksoud, however, can obscure the simple fact that the aforementioned Agreement was ratified by the Parliament of Lebanon virtually unanimously. Evidently the Lebanese Parliament also failed to recognize the "dynamic interaction of [these] two legitimacies".

122. The representative of Lebanon will no doubt wish to convey to the Parliament of Lebanon this gentle rebuke to which it was treated by Mr. Maksoud. The truth, of course, is entirely different. What the Parliament of Lebanon perhaps failed to foresee was not the "dynamic interaction of [these] two legitimacies" but the very dynamic action of one illegitimacy, that is, the abuse of Lebanon by the Syrian invaders. This, of course, as we all know, has been the cause for the unilateral renunciation of the Agreement of 17 May 1983 by the Government of Lebanon. But, true to form, Mr. Maksoud has again displayed his inability or unwillingness, or both, to face up to the truth.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*

---

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[2] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).

[3] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, Nos. 970-973.

[4] See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, Washington, D.C. (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

## كيفية الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع انحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الامم المتحدة ،قسم البيع في نيويورك او في جنيف .

## 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

## HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

## COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

## КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

## COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61313—February 1993—2,050